

AGENDA		DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I.	Item 1 2:00pm – 2:30pm	Nirav Shah	
		<p>Pulse Check</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Introduce a conversation around what is working / not working <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participation and engagement ○ Connection with leadership council □ What is working well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Candace says the workgroup collaboration is appreciated ○ Akram says a lot of progress has been made in the Scorecard workgroup (new scorecards being made) ○ Robert says the flexibility in the group as opposed to a more rigid structure is a positive ○ Gary says having concrete deliverables in the Scorecard workgroup has helped steer them in the right direction ○ Candace says opening up these conversations are very helpful and imply forward momentum □ What isn't working well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lauren says the more nebulous nature of their assigned task in the CE workgroup has been challenging ○ Candace says the documentation found on the ECHO website doesn't all align and can be confusing to navigate (charters, roadmaps, committee & workgroup guidance, etc) ○ Andrew shares the same sentiment as Candace, emphasizing the scope of the Performance Monitoring Committee's task is perhaps too expansive or lacks direction 	
II.	Item 2 2:30pm – 3:00pm	Nirav Shah	
		<p>Attendance and Committee Member Structure Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Discussion regarding attendance and voting off members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve Harrel has found employment which does not allow him time to attend future meetings ○ Donna Ware has had conflicts with meeting schedules but does want to attend and is otherwise active in other groups ○ Nirav proposes vote to remove and replace Theo, Alma and Steve 	<p>Fill the 3 seats that were voted off, ensure that we are meeting the diversity requirements regarding equity advocates and those with lived expertise</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vote is passed □ Nirav brings up that we are not meeting the required seats assigned to equity advocates and those with lived expertise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Candace mentions it can be challenging to recruit those with lived expertise due to technological and communication barriers 	
<p>III. Item 3 3:00pm– 3:15pm</p>	<p>Meagan Biscamp</p>	<p>PIP Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ What initiates a PIP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scorecard result of below 60 ○ HUD monitoring findings ○ If a project doesn't spend below 10% or \$50,000 □ Caritas are on a Performance PIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Very close to scoring below 60%, they volunteered to go forward with the PIP ○ Scored low on timeliness of data entry ○ 1 out of 4 clients that exited homelessness returned ○ Needs extra HMIS training to ensure staff enters data correctly ○ June 8th training at ECHO which will wrap up the PIP □ Lifeworks were on a spending PIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Did not spend below 10% of funds ○ They mentioned staff turnover, extra vouchers utilized which resulted in less of their own spending, and pandemic impacts ○ They have been meeting regularly to discuss future spend down ○ Meeting with Caritas and SAFE to discuss spend down ○ Their HR and talent acquisition team are implementing more strategies to increase retention ○ As of now they are on track to spend down for future projects □ Lifeworks were also on a performance PIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scored below 60 point threshold ○ Timeliness of data and annual assessments ○ Low staffing capacity and COVID impacts 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ HATC are on a spending PIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ De-obligated more than 10% of funds ○ Lack of referrals from service partner ○ Need to redistribute funds across budget line items ○ They've completed a grant amendment to shift funds into 2 addtl budget line items (supportive services & HMIS) ○ Requested addtl referrals from supportive service partner ○ Hired full time social worker ○ They are predicted to spend below 10% on current grant 	
<p>IV. Item 4 3:15pm– 3:30pm</p>		<p>Workgroup Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Coordinated Entry <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has been meeting for about a month ○ Gained addtl members (Lauren, Candace, Preston, Andrew, Liz Baker, Chris Davis, Claire Burrus) ○ Next step: Analysis of components of CE system ○ Developing timeline alongside workgroup structure ○ Should have more action items to present in June or July meetings ☑ Scorecard Workgroup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initiated 3 subgroups under workgroup (Data, Performance Metrics, New Metrics ie equity) ○ Data Quality Subgroup has finished their work, once the other two groups are finished the Scorecard Workgroup will come together and meet to discuss their findings 	
<p>Adjournment</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting: June 29, 2023 2:00PM – 3:30PM; Virtual meeting via Zoom 	

